

City of Taylorsville
Planning Commission Work Session
Minutes
Tuesday – March 22, 2005 – 6:00 P.M.
2600 West Taylorsville Blvd – Council Chambers

Attendance:

Planning Commission

Angelo Calacino, Chair
Phil Hallstrom
Blaine Smith
Ted Jensen
Aimee Newton
Joan Rushton-Carlson
Dama Barbour
Excused: Kristie Overson

Community Development Staff

Michael Maloy, City Planner
Dan Udall, City Planner
Jean Gallegos, Secretary/Recorder
Excused: Mark McGrath, Nick Norris

PUBLIC: One student from the Community College.

WELCOME: **Commissioner Calacino** welcomed those present, explained the purpose of tonight's meeting was participating in a work session and opened the meeting at 6:00 p.m. [18:07:40](#)

CONSENT AGENDA

1. Request to extend preliminary approval of the Parker-Jimenez Estates Subdivision located at 2533 West 6200 South. (Michael Maloy – City Planner)

Mr. Maloy advised that applicant submitted a request for extension beyond her April 2005 deadline because her family has been undecided on whether or not to build on the site. Now at least one of her children has expressed interest in doing so, so she would like a one year extension.

2. Minutes: Review and approval of Planning Commission meeting minutes for February 22, 2005.

MOTION [18:08:59](#) **Commissioner Rushton-Carlson** - I move for approval of the entire consent agenda as proposed, including the Minutes, with minor changes, which have been conveyed to the Recorder for correction.

SECOND: **Commissioner Barbour**

VOTE: **Commissioner Hallstrom**

AYE

Commissioner Smith

AYE

Commissioner Jensen

AYE

Commissioner Newton

AYE

Commissioner Rushton-Carlson

AYE

Commissioner Barbour

AYE

Motion passes unanimously.

WORK SESSION

3. Discussion concerning draft comprehensive landscaping requirements. (Michael Maloy)

3.1 [18:09:57](#) **Mr. Maloy** advised that the City does not presently have a comprehensive landscape ordinance. A few years ago requirements were initiated to install landscaping within a certain amount of time, however, no definition was in place as to what constitutes landscaping. Also of interest to staff are ways to reduce the overall landscape percentages through quality. **Mr. Maloy** explained the objectives to be:

- Bring all landscaping issues/requirements into one comprehensive ordinance.
- Address park strips.
- Address water conservation.
- Address both commercial and residential properties.
- Address landscape maintenance as well as requirements for new construction.
- Address “urban forestry” and “Tree City USA”.
- Address landscaping for new road projects and other public improvement projects.
- Address/recognize various tree lists.
- Recognize street and corridor landscaping plans.
- Incentives for special designs.

3.2 **DISCUSSION:**

- [18:16:50](#) **Commissioner Hallstrom** commented that every city has a landscaping ordinance, some are extremely strict and some absolutely empty. He did not want Taylorsville's ordinance to specify the types of trees needed on individual streets but rather to encourage the installation of as many trees as possible. He felt that would go far in improving the quality of landscaping. He felt there was a need for a better standard on landscaping for projects and wanted staff to use a more critical eye during their review process. He also felt that enforcement of the ordinance in regards to these issues needs more emphasis and that there was a need for a minimum maintenance standard. On a commercial building there is a clear cut process for final inspection of the structure but he felt the landscaping should be included as well, including bonding. [18:57:55](#) If the designated size trees are not installed, final approval would not be given. The City has a right to review maintenance of landscaping and should be aggressive in enforcement follow-up. He agreed that there needs to be very specific definition included on landscaping and that a maintenance standard is needed.
- [18:18:41](#) **Commissioner Barbour** agreed, however, wanted to see consistency along the main corridors, especially along 5400 South. She also felt that park strip landscaping should be required as part of the development process and contain trees from an acceptable list. [18:29:17](#) She expressed concern that the Redwood Road project is taking so much time that the City may lose developments in the meantime because of that. She was supportive of xeriscaping but felt it should be explicitly defined in the new ordinance because it could easily be interpreted as requiring no landscaping at all. **Commissioner Calacino** agreed, adding that a very specific definition of what constitutes xeriscaping should be included in the Landscape Ordinance. [18:51:20](#) **Commissioner Barbour** had comments reference side and rear yard public view, feeling that trees should be required. She agreed that there is sometimes a price to pay for trees because they do buckle sidewalks at times but felt it would be worth it to see tree lined streets again. With regard to the residential buffering against commercial sites which requires installation of walls between the two uses, she felt there was an issue with the landscaping between the two sets of walls. [18:52:21](#) She felt there needs to be an application of reason as to where any landscaping can be visible to people and not just for the sake of requiring people to plant a tree. **Commissioner Calacino** suggested adding a general section that says an exception can be made to the standards on a case-by-case basis through conditional use review by the Planning Commission. The requirement cannot be totally waived by any other means.
- [18:23:50](#) **Commissioner Smith** felt this was a very complicated issue and that specifying the types of trees allowed was necessary in order to maintain good sidewalk structure and avoid contact with power lines. He also felt that there needs to be a maintenance program in place to provide proper care on new projects and to clean up problems that exist presently in the City. [18:42:37](#)
- [18:24:13](#) **Commissioner Calacino** suggested adding under #14 a specific list of recommended types of trees for certain areas.
- [18:29:36](#) **Commissioner Jensen** added that trees should not be allowed to be cut down to achieve Xeriscaping and felt the tree requirement should be left in. **Commissioner Jensen** expressed concern about losing the beautiful tree lined streets which were prolific years ago. [18:35:59](#) Another of his issues was the barrier fencing along streets which backs to the sidewalk to create a very stark looking effect, which he would like to see changed. He had a concern about rain water retention and wanted to implement procedures to retain the water on the property to seep into the ground. [18:50:46](#) He also felt that concrete pavers were a negative and would like them replaced with appropriate landscaping, even if it is Xeriscaping. [18:48:43](#) He referenced paragraph 4.4 – Parking Areas, where it talks about landscaping in parking areas and he was confused as to whether that includes a requirement for a certain number of trees within the

parking lot islands. He asked that percentage be added to the next draft. **Mr. Maloy** advised that basically this identifies that there is a certain percentage of the parking lot itself that must be landscaped and that the parking lot islands must be maintained as landscape. There have been occasions wherein developers grew tired of maintaining an island and cement it. It does not address a tree canopy percentage, which would be appropriate to include in the parking lot landscape standard. **Commissioner Jensen** expressed interest in reducing the amount of heat generated by the concrete.

- [18:32:26](#) **Mr. Maloy** asked about the legality of having ground water discharge leach into the aquifers. **Commissioner Calacino** felt that the water probably would never make it down to an aquifer, which is between 700 and 800 feet below grade. He agreed, however, that there are concerns about the storm water running off impervious surfaces and taking foreign ingredients down into the soils. Salt Lake County will not allow sumps on properties because they become a nesting grounds for mosquitoes. That is the main reason they want the storm water taken off site. The usual method is into a catch basin, then into the drainage run off system. He suggested requiring down spouts which direct the water to run off into the landscaping areas.
- [18:56:01](#) **Commissioner Calacino** said xeriscaping must be defined in the new ordinance and that provisions in this ordinance mainly apply to new development. **Mr. Maloy** offered that while Xeriscaping is admittedly more expensive to install, perhaps a bonus could be offered if the project is of higher quality.
- [18:27:32](#) **Commissioner Newton** felt that paragraph 7.5 regarding park strip landscaping should be a requirement and not an incentive credit. [18:56:15](#) She also felt that there should be a definition on what constitutes a berm and suggested the use of xeriscaping be looked at seriously. [18:25:51](#)
- [19:00:57](#) **Commissioner Calacino** offered the following additional suggestions: Ref #3 – Setback. There needs to be at least a 15% overall area maintained on properties. Ref #4.1 – Side and Rear Yards - It requires a minimum of 5' of landscaping in the side yard and abutting property line. That would be good if the building setback is different but that is applicable if the driveways or the parking lots of commercial developments are abutting residential properties, then they should maintain some type of landscaping strip. That might need to be defined to say it is in effect for parking lots or driveways abutting residential properties. That would encompass residentially zoned properties and residentially used properties. There are some places where there is a commercial zoning e which have apartment buildings. Ref #4.2 – Residential buffer. (Comments for 4.1 also apply here). Ref #4.5 – Minimum Number of Trees. There needs to be a minimum number of shrubs required for projects also. He recommended that the way to calculate the shrubs is to have one for every six lineal feet of building foundation. For a new project that would mean one shrub for every six feet of new building. If the project is an addition, that would be based solely on the addition and not the existing structure. That ties over to #9.4 – Installation of Landscaping, if the project affects the building or the yard and constitutes a 25% expansion, it could impact the compliance of the property. The whole site is subject to compliance review for landscaping, parking lot spaces, etc. and there may need to be a cut-off for expansion established. There are properties that will forever be in a non-compliant status and that is an issue which must be resolved. On 7.6 Berms – **Commissioner Calacino** said he would that expanded to include screen and screen walls which include landscaping in front as alternative solutions to solely landscaped raised berms. He also touched on the tree list, shrub list and ground cover list specified, and adding a section to allow the Planning Commission to review projects that are looking for an exception. That would be done through conditional use. Another issue is the bonding for landscaping. When a project is approved, a bond should be posted for landscaping, to be held for at least two years. There may be a partial release after the first year but the remainder held to allow the planted material to become fully established in growth, which takes a couple of years. Two things can happen – either put it in or bond for it. That way if they call for a certificate of occupancy on the building, they can get into the building even though they have not yet landscaped it. **Commissioner Calacino** asked Staff to consider recommendations they were given tonight when making their final draft preparation and to then bring it back for Commission approval.

NO MOTION REQUIRED – DISCUSSION ONLY.

4. Design Standards for Commercial and Residential. (Michael Maloy, City Planner)

4.1 [19:08:59](#) **Commissioner Calacino** introduced this item by saying that he had discussed this with Michael Maloy, City Planner and felt the need to develop architectural and site design standards. The main purpose is to familiarize the Planning Commissioners with different forms of architecture and site design elements in order for the City to come up with their own set of standards. The intent was to develop actual design standards, not in ordinance

form but as a policy for standards to allow flexibility when reviewing projects. It helps Staff from the inception of a new project to have a beginning basis. (At this point he turned the time over to Mr. Maloy).

4.2 [19:10:46](#) **Mr. Maloy** said that this session tonight is the kick-off of the topic with the Planning Commission. The Community Development Director suggested the possibility of form based development standards. His objective in his position following the General Plan update has the goal to update the zoning Ordinance and he will make a presentation on that to the Commission at a future meeting. He advised that Commissioner Calacino is in favor of having development guidelines that the Staff could refer to in working with the developers. In fact, that has been suggested in the current ordinance that the Planning Commission put that together. Up until now, that possibility has not been looked at, however, Staff has started using a fairly consistent pallet of conditions with regard to some of the commercial developments. Staff agrees with Commissioner Calacino's proposal that a guidance document needs to be created for development, whether that is a policy or ultimately an ordinance. It is anticipated that tonight Staff will present images to see what the Commissioners would like to see here and identify what works and what does not. (At this point, Mr. Maloy gave a visual slide presentation of differing design images, showing both good and bad examples). **Mr. Maloy** then asked for Commissioner's input.

4.3 **DISCUSSION:**

- [19:28:17](#) **Commissioner Barbour** reiterated that proper landscaping is absolutely essential, especially adding more trees along the City streets and **Commissioner Hallstrom** added that Staff and the Commission need to be more assertive in getting better landscaping from developers.
- [19:50:56](#) **Commissioner Hallstrom** said that design standards are exciting but that the first priority of the Commission needs to be the landscaping ordinance. Both are necessary but the City needs the landscaping issue dealt with first.
- **Commissioner Calacino** commented that the General Plan update sets the stage in showing land uses and where the City wants specific uses. [19:49:50](#) The next stage is to establish development standards to show what needs to be implemented. He asked Commissioners to look at other areas and do some thinking about design standards for Taylorsville to be discussed during a future meeting.
- [19:54:08](#) **Commissioner Barbour** suggested that Sandy City has a well written maintenance ordinance and **Mr. Maloy** advised he would obtain that document and give each Commissioner a copy for review. **Commissioner Barbour** also suggested that Staff work with the L.A.R.P. Committee on the types of trees to be included. **Mr. Maloy** advised that the L.A.R.P. Committee has prepared such a list and Staff has been furnishing it to applicants.
- **Commissioner Calacino** suggested that the City may want to become involved in a 50/50 type program for trees where the City suggests the type of tree that would work well and asks the applicant to plant that type, with the City contributing half the cost.
- **Commissioner Barbour** said the City is discussing the possibility of a franchise tax as something to be used by the City to improve the right of ways, etc., rather than it just going into the budget and becoming a part of it.

NO MOTION REQUIRED – DISCUSSION ONLY

ADJOURNMENT: By motion of **Commissioner Barbour**, the meeting was adjourned at [19:56:13](#).

Respectfully submitted by:

Jean Gallegos, Secretary/Recorder
Planning Commission

Approved in meeting held on May 10, 2005